



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,733	08/25/2003	Kung-Fu Chen	TOP 314	1158
23995	7590	12/10/2004	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/646,733

Applicant(s)

CHEN, KUNG-FU

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/03, 4/2/04
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 5-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: The first occurrence of LVDS, TMDS, ITX must be spelled out. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 9, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites a third cable but the first and second cables have not been introduced in claim 4.

Claim 15 recites a fourth cable but the first and second and third cables have not been introduced in claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2839

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-12, 17-21, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boesch et al. (6570561).

Boesch (Figures 1-5) shows an electronic device having a motherboard 24a, a liquid crystal display (LCD) module 20 and a converter board 34 coupled to the motherboard by a first cable 48 with a first connector 50 at its end. A second cable 54 with a connector 52 at its end is used to connect the converter to the LCD. A second connector corresponding to the first connector 50 on the motherboard and connectors on the other end of cable 54 or at the LCD are inherent. The connectors and converter board are LVDS type.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boesch et al. (6570561) in view of Baker (5815735).

Boesch shows all the features of these claims except a supporting member between the motherboard and converter board. Such a feature is common knowledge. Baker shows a supporting member 40 between two boards. It would have been

Art Unit: 2839

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide a supporting member between the Boesch's motherboard and the converter board because this would keep the two boards separated as taught by Baker.

10. Claims 7-8, 13-14, 16 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boesch et al. (6570561) in view of Baker (5815735).


Boesch shows all the features of these claims except the connectors and converter board being TMDS type and the motherboard being mini ITX type. Such a feature is well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature to Boesch's device because TMDS type connectors and converter boards and mini ITX motherboard are well known and selecting one type over the other only involves routine skill in the art.

Contact Information

10. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (571) 272-2099. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is (703) 872-9306.


Chandrika Prasad
Primary examiner
December 8, 2004